

FROM :

PHONE NO. : 0000

Jan. 23 2007 10:32AM P08

Application no 10/642,813

Application Dated August 19,2003

Reply to office action of October 25,2006

Amendments to the Drawings:

Fig 3.A

Legend "Prior art" has been added

It shows large radius circular coil and fluoroscopic facility from an angulated view.

13 U arm cath lab with fluoroscopic facility

14 large radius circular coil

Attachment: Replacement sheet

Annotated sheet showing changes

Application no 10/642,813
Application Dated August 19,2003
Reply to office action of October 25,2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Priority

Page 2 and para 1

In my understanding I should be given this priority, however you are a better judge of patent office guidelines.

Drawings

Page 2 and para 2

Fig 3 A is amended as desired

Specifications

Page 3 and para 3

Fig 3.A- specification matter is added.

Claim Objections

Page 3 and para 4

Claims 17, 28, 29 and 30 are changed as per your letter.

Page 3 and para 5

I could not understand these dependent and independent forms, I wrote the claims to the best of my ability. Since I am based at long distance and can not afford a patent attorney I allow you to change the claims language.

Claims Rejections 35 USC § 112

Page 4 and para 6

As stated in previous communication that I am an interventional cardiologist and I can not afford a patent attorney. I am based at a long distance therefore I authorize you to change the claims language.

Page 4 and para 7

the PPM/ICD box – your interpretation that it means housing(can) of the PPM/ICD is correct. You are also right that it is implanted in body. The PPM/ICD box is not external after implantation in human body. The telemetry wand is normally placed on the chest wall(outside the patient body) and it remotely establishes the connection between the

Application no 10/642,813

Application Dated August 19,2003

Reply to office action of October 25,2006

PPM/ICD and the computer outside the body. Your interpretation that "the PPM/ICD has two radiologically distinct poles regardless of whether the generator fails" is correct, because in event of generator failure the PPM/ICD box can be connected to an outside power source for recharging battery. Claim 17 has been rewritten as following

A permanent pacemaker or cardioverter-defibrillator(PPM/ICD) system comprising:

A PPM/ICD box ;

A small electric power generator within the PPM/ICD box comprising a small magnet and coil wherein the coil encircles the magnet and the magnet is adapted to rotate;

A battery within the PPM/ICD box adapted to be recharged by the small electric generator;

Radiological markers on the PPM/ICD box which help it to align with a large radius circular coil;

A large radius circular coil which can move in multiple planes and has fluoroscopic facility for alignment with the radiological markers on the PPM/ICD box;

If built in small electric generator fails, the PPM/ICD box has two radiologically distinct poles covered with insulating material to connect to an outside power source to recharge the battery;

A programming software written on a non-rewritable CD;

A telemetry wand so that by using a personal computer with internet and multimedia facility the PPM/ICD is connected to a programming centre which may be hundreds of miles away and thus making follow up of patients easy and available at all times;

Wherein above technology can also be applied to other battery based implantable medical devices.

Page 5 and para 8

The crude system I tried had a magnet surrounded by a coil(small built in generator). I think that such a small generator can also be made other way round i.e. coil in centre and magnet surrounding it. Though I am not sure about it, I therefore wrote it in my claims.

FROM :

PHONE NO. : 0000

Jan. 23 2007 10:34AM P11

Application no 10/642,813
Application Dated August 19,2003
Reply to office action of October 25,2006

Page 5 and para 9

Your interpretation is right that the centre is not a part of the invention. The system is adapted to be used with such centre. There is no such active centre at present and with this technology we can create such centre in future which will provide a 24 hour programming facility which patient can access even from home.

Response to Arguments

Page 6 and para 10

As I have written earlier my application is different from prior art. I can clarify if any other doubts exist which are not clarified.

Page 6 and para 11

I am unable to understand this paragraph and I authorize you to change the claim language so that it satisfies requirements. Note - I am based at long distance.

Conclusion

Page 6 and para 12

Notice of appeal form filled

\$250=00 payment enclosed

I am unable to understand most of the language of this paragraph.

Claims 17, 28,29 and 30 changed as advised.

I am an interventional cardiologist and I can not afford a patent attorney so I allow you to change the claims as from this distance I can not come frequently to visit.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted

Vipul Narain Roy
(Dr. Vipul Narain Roy)

Application No 10/642813
Application dated August 19, 2003
Reply to office action of October 25, 2006
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

Prior Art (added)




Fig 3.A

Page 10 of 10